

M E E T I N G M I N U T E S

Meeting: Evergreen Visioning Project Meeting #11

Date: April 14, 2004

The tenth meeting of the Evergreen Visioning Project Task Force was held on April 14, 2004 in Cougar Hall at Evergreen Valley High School at 7:00 PM.

Task Force Attendees: Councilmember Dave Cortese, Alan Covington (Charrette participant), Bill Kozlovsky (Quimby Creek), Daniel Gould (Silver Creek Valley Country Club), Daniel Jacobs (Meadowlands), Gordon Lund (Groesbeck), Homing Yip (EHRAG), Ike White (Mt. Pleasant), Jenny Chang (EHRAG), Khanh Nguyen (Charrette participant, West Evergreen SNI), Lillian Jones (Charrette participant), Mark Milioto (Evergreen Little League), Mike Alvarado (Charrette participant), Paul Pereira (Boggini), Rick Caton (Charrette participant), Steve Tedesco (Charrette participant, Boys & Girls Club), Sylvia Alvarez (Charrette participant, EESD Trustee), Tom Andrade (Charrette participant, EESD Superintendent), Victor Klee (Charrette participant), Vikki Lang (Alternate, ELL)

Members of the Public: Marty Shelton, Vivian Miranda, Sal Alvarez

Development Community: Gerry De Young, Tom Armstrong, Mike Hill, Jim Eller, Mark Perlberger, Bonnie Moss, Jessica Heinzelman

Staff: PBCE Deputy Director Laurel Prevetti, Richard Keit (RDA), Scott Reese (PRNS), Dave Mitchell (PRNS), Julie Mark (PRNS), Rabia Chaudhry (Council Office)

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Councilmember Cortese welcomed the group and dispensed with introductions in the interest of time.

II. REVIEW AND FINALIZE REVISED WORK PLAN

Laurel Prevetti walked the group through the proposed workplan, which details the Evergreen Visioning Project process through June 2005. She added that just over a year remains until this project is brought before the San Jose City Council. Later this year the group will not have to convene as frequently as they do now. Task force members were asked to take note of the fact that there will be two meetings in April, three in May (two weekday and one Saturday) and two in June. This aggressive approach will enable us to meet the requirements for beginning the environmental review.

Cortese informed the group that they would need to convene on a Saturday to look at the densities in the Evergreen Specific Plan as well as tour the campus industrial sites. He asked the task force if they wanted to expand this Saturday meeting into a three-hour session in order to cover other business or if they would prefer extending two of the

weeknight meetings. The majority of the task force was in favor of expanding the Saturday meeting. The likely date was indicated as 5/22/04.

III. DISCUSS PUBLIC OUTREACH APPROACH

Bonnie Moss explained that much insight was gained from the three questions that were asked of each task force member at the previous meeting and the information was the foundation for the Evergreen Visioning Project Community Engagement Strategy that was being distributed to the group. This strategy seeks to achieve two things: genuine community engagement and allegiance to a win-win outcome. Eliciting community feedback would be achieved through three mediums: community meetings (meetings regarding specific properties and meetings with individual stakeholder groups), two-way communication (mailers, questionnaires) and utilization of local media and public information (letters to the editor, press advisories).

Moss indicated that she would return in May with a meeting schedule for specific sites. She will also develop a simple yet comprehensive package of materials for task force members to use if/when they speak before groups about the Visioning Project. Materials would include an FAQ, a data collection sheet, etc. In the meanwhile, she asked the task force to take a few moments to review the Community Engagement Strategy and write down any questions, concerns, opportunities, etc.

IV. INTRODUCE EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE OPPORTUNITY SITE

Prevetti explained that vacant property on the Evergreen Valley College Campus was the next opportunity site for discussion. There are actual two parcels under examination. The first is an expansion of the current retail at the corner of San Felipe and Yerba Buena Roads. EVC has a general plan amendment on file with the city but has decided to take part in the Evergreen Visioning Project and therefore that GPA is on hold. Prevetti commented that expanding the retail at this location may have an effect on other retail centers in Evergreen and therefore a retail study will be commission to determine the viability of the current and proposed retail nodes. The second site under discussion is located along the northern part of the college property. This site may be useful for student and/or teacher housing (a sorely needed element in our city) but we need to be mindful of the EVC's future plans. Prevetti then invited Mike Hill to give the College's perspective on future development.

Hill explained that he is Vice Chancellor of the San Jose Evergreen Community College District, which administers both Evergreen Valley and San Jose City Colleges. Hill personally works out of the EVC campus and lives in Evergreen, too. He is vested and interested in Evergreen's future and feels the Evergreen Visioning Project is a great way to help Evergreen achieve its full potential. He explained that the EVC was pleased with the six-acre development at the corner of San Felipe and Yerba Buena Roads. Revenues from this center have gone back into the college – they've been used to construct the soccer fields (which are in high demand by the community) and part of the observatory. In essence, these revenues have been reinvested into the community. As far as expanding the retail at this location goes, that was EVC's initial request. Whatever is done here, however, needs to be done well as it is in the college's front yard (so to speak). The college has already taken into consideration and masterplanned its needs in terms of facility expansion. Whatever else occurs on this property, economics need to be kept in mind and the college is seeking to expand its revenue base. He underscored Prevetti's earlier comment about the need for teacher/staff housing, adding that the college loses candidates for professional positions due to the sheer inaffordability of the area. Ideally,

housing developed here could be made available to other public sector employees. He noted that the college isn't looking to construct dormitories (which are exclusive to students) but create general accommodations that could also be utilized by students. Overall the college is keeping their options open – considering reconfiguring the college campus if it makes economic sense or leasing out space for professional uses and then recovering it later if needed for campus expansion.

Returning to the discussion of possible housing use, Hill indicated that any housing installed here would not look like what is in the Evergreen Specific Plan. Instead, it would be multifamily dwellings with a mix of rental and ownership. The college could add anywhere between 600-900 units.

Prevetti asked the task force for feedback on Hill's comments. She told the group that as in previous discussions of opportunity sites, the architect will return with possible versions of what the property could look like, bearing in the mind the college's desire in particular to have a greater presence on San Felipe Road.

Task force member Bill Kozlovsky asked if the retail study planned by the city will dovetail with the EVC's plans. Prevetti responded that probably two separate studies would be conducted but staff can compare for consistencies.

Task force member Sylvia Alvarez asked how the college can own the land on which houses are built but still allow for the homes to be owned by someone else. Hill responded that California State University has a similar setup and it is possible. Cortese added that it is the same concept as a ground lease.

Task force member Sherry Gilmore asked whether or not SJECCD makes money from the tenants at San Felipe/Yerba Buena. Hill responded the developer pays a per annum ground rent to the district. Gilmore followed up by asking which generates more revenue, housing or retail. Hill said that both can work but it depends on the economic structure. Most likely the district will need to include both on the campus.

Task force member Steve Tedesco asked if it is legal for the district to allocate housing just for faculty. Prevetti responded yes, because it is on their property. Were the city desirous of doing something similar, they could only market the housing for a particular group but ultimately anyone could live there. Tedesco followed by asking if homes could be designated for SJPd and SJFD. Cortese responded yes, and some non-profit organizations have created the legal framework to do this.

Task force member Dan Gould commented that Evergreen needs an emergency room or mini hospital. The ones in San Jose are too far and EVC might be a suitable site.

Task force member Mike Alvarado asked if EVC tries to improve student life. Hill responded that there is a director specifically for this, someone who tries to connect student needs back to the college. Alvarado followed by asking if proposed development of the college's vacant lands will account for students' needs. Hill said yes, but he's unsure as to how, primary because EVC's needs are so diverse. Alvarado asked if the college has spoken with the other property owners in the Evergreen Visioning Project about their addressing housing needs. Hill said that much of this rests on affordability. Plus, the college would like their staffs' homes to be located on EVC property to encourage the sense of community. Alvarado asked about the status of the library. Hill said that the

college library is done. As for the City of San Jose's proposal to locate a library in southeast Evergreen, college and city staffs have been in discussions for over a year as to how both entities can provide resources for Evergreen. Cortese added that EVC at one point had offered to locate the southeast branch library on their campus and asked Mark Day to incorporate this possibility into one of his designs.

Task force member Mark Milioto asked if the college's goal to increase revenue will allow for the placement of any amenities on their property. Hill responded that EVC is open to leveraging resources for use by both the college and community.

Task force member Ike White asked if the potential affordable housing for college staff could be expanded to include elementary, middle and high school teachers. Hill said the college would like to try to offer that opportunity. White expressed concern at the fact that many teachers who work on the east side commute from outside the area.

Cortese opined that he feels the commercial office space idea should be further explored at this site. He reminded the group that task force member Vince Songcayawon had brought this up at an earlier meeting (the shortage of such services in Evergreen) despite the fact that anything created would be in direct competition to his personal business.

Task force member Gordon Lund commented that in the 1980s there was a suggestion to place the Evergreen Community Center nearer to the college. He asked why EVC's philosophy has changed to allow for revenue. What is the mission of the college that it is allowing for this shift in thinking? He also asked whether it was possible to install a wellness center on campus. Hill responded that EVC does have a wellness center, but it is probably not to the scale of what Lund is envisioning. As to EVC's overall philosophy, for years developers approached the colleges, wanting to convince them to develop their land. EVC held them at bay until they completed a masterplan exercise to determine the college's future needs. Once a balance of lands was identified, EVC began entertaining other proposals. The college's long-term goal is to retain land ownership but develop profitable enterprise. This way, if ever the college needs to further expand, it will not have sold its land off.

Gould asked what the college's revenue targets are. He also asked about the potential 600-900 units – at what density? Hill said that the college hasn't yet decided. The hope is that the revenue will be substantial enough to go back into services for the college.

Kozlovsky summarized what he felt the Task Force's concerns to be, a question of whether the revenues would be used for the college or for the community. Hill said he felt both, especially since the college in itself is a community asset. Kozlovsky followed by asking whether revenues generated would be used internal or external to the campus. Hill said both and cited the soccer fields as an example. Although located on the campus and used by the college's team, the community also heavily uses them. Cortese added that whatever development the college pursues, they would have to contribute to our facilities improvement district.

V. INTRODUCE RETAIL NODES AND CONCEPT FOR DESIGN GUIDELINES

Prevetti reminded the task force about the retail nodes that exist throughout Evergreen. Ideally these sites will also be recipients of investment dollars by the developer community

and the task force was asked to review the retail nodes map in their binders, noting that the red circles indicate areas in need of enhancement. Perhaps we add apartments above the retail stores or include professional opportunities to expand the diversity.

Alvarez asked how to work with privately owned centers, like the one at Quimby and White Roads. Cortese responded that that shopping center has been identified as a "need." He said that RDA could outreach and encourage another private owner to take over the seven tenant center. So far the Task Force has dealt with properties where the owners are interested in participating. We haven't yet dealt with the smaller developed/undeveloped properties where the owners aren't yet involved in this process. Richard Keit added that RDA has in the past tried to work with the Quimby and White owners to impress upon them the importance of improving their stores but were unable to reach consensus. Eminent domain could be applied but there are financial issues involved with that. RDA is willing to reengage the owners via the Evergreen Visioning Project process.

VI. INTRODUCE PLEASANT HILLS GOLF COURSE OPPORTUNITY SITE

Cortese prefaced the subject by stating that in a few minutes those individuals who represent property owners will be asked to leave the meeting. This isn't because this property is more or less extraordinary relative to the other properties we've discussed but because there is no jumping off point. The Arcadia property had the charrette plan, the campus industrial sites - the Evergreen Specific Plan and Evergreen Valley College - the gpa on file. Cortese needs to know from the Task Force what the jumping off point for this property should be. Negotiations for the Evergreen Visioning Project have thus far been cordial but sometimes each side will need to meet privately. Cortese may at times need to caucus just with the development community and he will let the Task Force know when this happens. *At this point the development community left the room. Minutes from this discussion will be made available under a separate cover.*

VII. NEXT STEPS

The meeting adjourned at 9:40pm.